

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, November 5, 1982.

Present: M. Singer, Chairman, D. Taddeo, J. Chaikelson, R. Roy, J. Princz, T. Arbuckle-Maag, A. Broes, C. Bertrand, K. Bindon, C. Kalman, B. Lewis, M. Oppenheim, S. McEvenue, G. Newsham, R. Pallen, J. Ryan, L. Sanders, H. Shulman, M. Squires, A. Ketter, S. Ferguson, A. Megaan, J. Griffin, M. Mingarelli, J. Doyle, K. Kusano, K. Riener, A. Ross, B. Sahni, O. Schwelb, M. Taylor, A. Marinakis, G. Taggart, J. Young, E. Keirstead.

Absent with Regrets: A. Galler, F. MacLeod, D. McDougall, B. Petrie, H. Proppe

Note: Because of a malfunction of the audio equipment the first one and a half hours of the proceedings of this meeting were not clearly recorded. An attempt has been made to reconstruct the essential deliberations of Council.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

32-11-1 The agenda was approved (Roy/Pallen).

3. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman reported on the decisions taken at the Senate meeting which was held on the previous Friday.

4. Elections (ASFC 82-11-D2)

32-11-2 The list of nominations as presented by the Steering Committee was accepted (McEvenue/Broes).

a) Senate

The Chairman reported that although the Steering Committee has drawn up a list of nominations for the position on Senate none of the nominees had accepted. There were no nominations from the floor with the result that the election was put over to the next meeting of Council.

b) Faculty Appeal Committee (Academic Regulations Regarding Re-evaluation)

Prof. R. Wareham (English) was elected by acclamation to fill the position of "member" on the Faculty Appeal Committee. The election of an "alternate" was carried over to the next meeting.

Ms. Patricia Smyth was elected by acclamation to fill the position of "member" of the Faculty Appeal Committee. Three positions remain vacant for which elections will be held at the next meeting of Council.

c) Arts and Science Faculty Panel (Academic Regulations Regarding Cheating)

Ms. Theresa Maioni was elected by acclamation to the Arts and Science Faculty Panel. Five student positions remain vacant.

d) Student Request Committee

Ms. Sandra Sirois was elected by acclamation to the Student Request Committee.

e) Curriculum Committee

Ms. Simone Richard and Mr. Aga Okwudi were elected by acclamation to the Curriculum Committee.

f) Arts and Science Committee on Registration and Course Change

One student representative to be named by C.U.S.A. and approved by Council on the Committee on Registration and Course Change remains vacant.

g) Appraisals Committee - to evaluate three units in Division IV

Ms. Laurie Harries was elected by acclamation to the Appraisals Committee. The election of a second student will take place at the next meeting.

h) Core Curriculum Study Group

Ms. Simone Richard was elected by acclamation to the Core Curriculum Study Group.

5. Curriculum Committee Report - Graduate Curriculum Changes 1983-84, Report 37G (ASFC 82-11-D3)

Prof. Schmid presented the report at the request of Prof. Drysdale and with the approval of Council.

82-11-3 It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Taddeo) to approve the Graduate Curriculum Changes 1983-84 (ASFC 82-11-D3)

Prof. Schmid asked to have a change made in the language requirements for the M.A. in English and gave an explanation for his request.

82-11-4 It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Taddeo) to amend the first sentence of the text to read as follows:

"All candidates for the M.A. in English must demonstrate an ability to read literary or critical texts in another language. This ability may be demonstrated by obtaining a grade of Pass on a reading comprehension exam set by the Department of English. In order to undertake a thesis which necessitates a second language, a student must demonstrate competence in that language to the satisfaction of the Committee on Graduate Studies."

A lengthy debate followed.

The question was called. A vote was taken on the motion to approve the Graduate Curriculum Changes, 1983-84 as amended and it was carried. (Mr. Mingarelli asked to have his opposing vote recorded.)

8. Looking to the Future - Report of the Committee on Priorities and Planning and Phase I Report of the University Mission Study - second session (ASFC 82-11-D1)

---

The Chairman said that he, personally, wished to thank the members of Steering Committee whom he thought had extended themselves in five meetings of the committee which had been held in the past six weeks.

He noted that an effort had been made to bring the recommendations of the reports to Council in a way that would be useful and rational; items requiring action had been selected for discussion and were assigned the letter A while other recommendations were labelled d - may deserve discussion by Faculty Council; p - statements of principle, and o - observations requiring no further action from Faculty Council. Provost Singer assured the members of Council that any of the recommendations not considered A - priority by the Steering Committee could be brought forward for discussion if any member so desired.

The Chairman drew attention to the fact that the items selected by the Steering Committee had been arranged under seven topics for particular discussion; the first of these being the opportunities for Concordia as described in the Peat Marwick document. The other six categories refer to the recommendations in the Fahey Report.

In answer to a question put to him as to the purpose of this exercise, Provost Singer said that he thought that if Council should decide to take issue with any of the recommendations, which the Rector intends to carry to the Board of Governors, Council's position would be made known. Silence would be interpreted as being in agreement with the recommendations.

In the discussion preceding the debate on selected recommendations the following points were raised:



Prof. Maag, in referring to the section on opportunities for Concordia, pointed out that the people asked to comment were an amazingly select sample and one likely to define the University's role in a way somewhat inimical to the interests of Arts and Science. She thought that the main point Arts and Science should make about these opportunities was namely the people surveyed; they did not sample the business community widely and obviously did not sample beyond it. She thought that a set of opportunities should have been arrived at after consulting widely, consequently she was loath to agree with this particular set.

Prof. Ryan expressed his irritation with Opportunity III (74) - Cost Effective Quality which struck him as being somewhat amoral and had already been demonstrated in the treatment of the part-time faculty. It was suggested that Opportunity IV (Recommendation 75) was not in the interest of a university.

Prof. Pallen was opposed to turning the university into a trade school.

Mr. Gott applauded the development of programmes which would lead to the job market. He thought that the day of a well-rounded education as an end in itself was no longer a valid concept, particularly with the encouragement by the government for programmes which would lead directly to employment.

Mr. Mingarelli took the opposite stand.

Prof. Maag suggested that Peat Marwick was out-of-date. Based on the experience of her work in Quebec over the past four years, she thought that it should be recognized that if all resources are channelled into one area the end result would be that that area would very quickly become oversupplied and that those people would not fit into any other category. There was need for people coming out of a more varied experience who have been taught to read, write, think, and to solve problems, and that that was the kind of experience Arts and Science could provide.

Prof. Oppenheim wondered about the implications of Opportunity IV (Recommendation 77). He did not see the connection between "to contribute to the social stability of Montreal," "providing advanced educational services," and "to help those to adapt to rapid social and economic change."

Dean Taddeo thought that in the discussion of the two reports Council must state clearly where it stands on the issues so as not to be counted out. With regard to the Peat Marwick document he noted that two previous speakers had questioned the extent to which the report is applicable to an academic institution and that Council ought to look at each one of the recommendations to see to what extent they are realistic or possible for Concordia and then to react to the recommendations in those terms; to

support or reject each item and to give reasons for acceptance or rejection. In this way the position of Arts and Science will be known to the higher authorities of the University.

The Provost replied that it was his intention to do that following this general, committee-of-the-whole type of discussion.

Prof. Bertrand thought that Council had better face up to the fact that this was an on-going process; that step one of Phase II is to rank the opportunities (he had some notion that that had already been done or was in the process of being done). In the light of that he thought that Council should rank the opportunities, perhaps 72 first, 78 second and 73 third, the others he felt said the same thing in different ways except perhaps for 74. He agreed with Prof. Ryan's statement that indeed the University was cost effective at the level of full-time and part-time faculty, but that statistics showed that that is not so in terms of administration, cum-administration, and that Council might want to look at that in terms of how that area might become cost effective.

Prof. Young noted that in the first analysis the Peat Marwick report focusses on the goals of the institution, something that he had been troubled about over the past 10-15 years, but he wondered if they had gone about it in the right way. The report appeared to him to be opportunist, that what they did was go through society, as they saw it, and perceive certain needs and gaps in it which he thought in itself was debatable, for example the economic development of Quebec. Buried in the report was the idea that social and cultural development should be left to the francophone universities and in comparison they did not deal with questions of the economic development of Quebec. Then on the other side in deriving the needs of society as they see them they have come up with this list of opportunities. He thought that Council should debate the question of whether the list of eight opportunities was complete; were there not others to be considered.

Prof. Shulman compared the report to a government royal commission.

Dean Chaikelson wondered if it was not premature to comment on the opportunities at this stage since the Phase II report supposedly will require much more attentive study of how the recommendations will affect the University or how they might change its direction. She was concerned about making decisions in the absence of information.

Prof. Sahni suggested that the Peat Marwick document could serve as a backdrop for discussion of the Fahey report. It was a statement of principles, and identified opportunities.

Dr. Pallen requested that Mr. Fiset, Assistant to the Principal of the Institute of Co-Operative Education, be given speaking privileges. The request was granted.

Based on his contact with executive officers of business corporations, during the process of placing students for work terms, Mr. Fiset expressed strong opposition to recommendation 75. He assured the members of Council that what the business community is looking for are people who can read, write, think, and effectively criticize. The main complaint against students who have been placed in the field was that they could not write reports, even though they had received high grades in their courses; they were unable to express themselves.

Prof. Kalman drew attention to the fact that recommendation 74 was closely aligned with the Fahey Report. He quoted from the latter.

Prof. Riener referred to a generation gap which exists between students and faculty. He thought that students were interested in programmes which would lead to employment while faculty had multiple goals because a university serves as a centre of learning, expansion and research.

Speaking as a member of the Commerce and Administration Faculty, he said that it was recognized that the B. Commerce degree programme was somewhat overspecialized while the B. Administration was more flexible and could produce a better balanced student. He thought there was room for more interdisciplinary courses cutting across departments and faculties.

The Chairman suggested that now that the speakers list had been exhausted Council had three choices on how to proceed:  
 1) to turn attention to the individual items to see whether Council wished to express itself on the items; 2) to draw back from the Peat Marwick document and turn to the Fahey report to see how its contents affect the issue just discussed; 3) that the members of Council consider delegating the responsibility to Steering Committee, or some other group, of preparing a statement of what the objection of Council is to the Peat Marwick document.

It was asked what the relationship was between the discussion in Council of the Phase I report and Phase II which was to take place later.

Asked to comment, Vice-Rector Breen said that the Phase II Steering Committee was in operation and would be starting on the second phase the following week. He thought it was important to get in-put from Council immediately.

Council moved out of the committee-of-the-whole.

Dean Chaikelson again made a plea for consideration of additional opportunities.



Prof. Maag thought that both reports had given the matter of research short treatment. She suggested that the success of the Psychology Department was due to the fact that its research is related to and seen by the community as being part of their priorities, such as stress in the family and drug dependence. One opportunity for Concordia is in expanding total service to the community. She stressed that by virtue of a very limited sampling the Peat Marwick group may have missed ideas and opportunities.

Prof. Sahni suggested that all departments be asked if they have any submissions to make on opportunities.

Provost Singer said that one of the messages members of the Council who are members of the Phase II Steering Committee would take to that group was the feeling in the community, now that Phase I had been issued, that there should be some consultation about Phase II.

Ms. Megaan thought that the Faculty should not lose sight of the goals articulated by members of Council in its deliberations in the past two years.

The scientific method used for the sample in the report was questioned and it was asked who the people were. Provost Singer gave reasons why the list had not been published, but he said he would notify the meeting on Monday that there was need for more detail as to the category of people interviewed.

At the request of Prof. Bertrand, the names of the members of the Phase II Steering Committee were read.

It was wondered why work on the Phase II report had begun before faculty had had time to discuss Phase I.

Dean Chaikelson explained how the opportunities referred to in the Phase I report had been developed over the summer months by sub-committees of the group.

Provost Singer explained why the Peat Marwick Report was being issued in two stages rather than in a single report. He then suggested that he would report to the Steering Committee of Council on the outcome of the Phase II Steering Committee meeting which was to be held on Monday, after which it would be decided on how best to present the issues to the next meeting of Council.

Prof. Kalman expressed his concern that the Fahey report to some extent had already done the ranking of opportunities, that it had placed Opportunity III in a very important position, and it was possible that the ranking of the priorities could be set before the Peat Marwick study had been completed. He thought

that the debate on the Fahey document should be postponed until the situation of the Peat Marwick study becomes clearer.

Prof. Ryan thought that a defeatist attitude and that the University should decide where it is going; that that should not be decided by outside agencies.

It was agreed that the recommendations of the Fahey report should now be considered and Provost Singer gave a brief explanation on the organization of the document prepared for Council's use (ASFC 82-11-D1).

#### Two Campus Operation (Recommendations 40 and 47)

It was suggested that the Faculty should be concerned about leaving McGill as the main downtown option for students. Many choose a university as much for geographic convenience as anything else, particularly evening students.

Dean Chaikelson thought that there was a need to plan very realistically for the Loyola Campus in order to avoid the situation of having it become a feeder campus for downtown.

Prof. Pallen pointed to the fact that the flexibility of one Faculty is affected by the changes made by another and gave as an example the decision of the Engineering Faculty to move downtown with the result that there was no longer the possibility for expansion of the wet disciplines in the Hall building.

Dean Taddeo reiterated the statement made at the last meeting that we were planning by default. That certain Faculties (Engineering and Commerce and Administration) had made moves because of space needs and constraints without consulting the other academic faculties. Nor was any consideration given to what impact those moves would have for the overall use of the facility of the University. Also, he wondered about the advisability of concentrating anglophone higher education facilities for Quebec in the city of Montreal within a ten-block area.

Dean Chaikelson drew attention to the fact that the building plan is for a building to house, not only the library, but space equal to all rented space downtown, and for expansion of the Vanier Library.

Some members of Council thought there was a need to have more information before a meaningful discussion on the two campus operation could take place while others maintained that the discussion ought to proceed in order to assure that decisions would not be made elsewhere without input from Council.

Provost Singer asked Vice-Rector Breen if he thought it would be useful to have a presentation about space at the next meeting of Council.



Vice-Rector Breen informed the members of Council that as indicated by Dean Chaikelson, part of the campaign being undertaken is for some construction downtown and some in the west end. What is not clear is the type of construction that should take place. What is possible still is if we can conceive of something that is defensible which could entail perhaps a little more construction in the west end and a little less downtown, that element could be implemented.

Provost Singer said that he would report to the Steering Committee on Tuesday on the outcome of the two meetings to take place before then (Phase II Steering Committee, Deans' meeting) and that the Steering Committee of Council would consider how to proceed.

### Restructuring of the University

#### Recommendation 57

"The offices of the two present Vice-Rectors Academic should be combined into one."

- 82-11-5 It was moved and seconded (Chaikelson/McEvenue) to support Recommendation 57. Vote: Carried

#### Recommendation 58

"...a single dean of Graduate Studies and Research would combine the offices of Dean of Graduate Studies and the Associate Vice-Rector, Academic (Research)."

- 82-11-6 It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Oppenheim) to support Recommendation 58. Vote: Defeated

- 82-11-7 It was moved and seconded (Bertrand/Maag) the Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends that the responsibility for Graduate Studies be given to the Academic Deans and that University-wide responsibility for research be assigned to the Vice-Rector Academic.

Provost Singer interrupted the discussion on the motion to speak about the date of the next meeting because he was obliged to leave at this point in the meeting. He thought that the members of Council should assume that there would be a special meeting held on November 12.

Provost Singer asked Dean Chaikelson to take the Chair in his absence.

The discussion on the motion continued.

A vote was taken and the motion was carried.

#### 9. Next meeting

November 12, 1982.

#### 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. (Taddeo/Shulman).